

Serial No. 09/731,004
September 22, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated February 12, 2003
Page 5 of 6

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 4 and 6.

Claims 1-8 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,051) in view of Razavi (RF Microelectronics, 1998). Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Amesfoort (U.S. Patent No. 5,712,596) in view of Razavi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-14.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"An oscillator having a resonance circuit connected to an amplifying circuit,

wherein **said amplifying circuit comprises an element having a frequency characteristic, thereby decreasing power amplification of said amplifying circuit by at least 3dB in a frequency band lower than about 0.5 times an oscillating frequency f_0 and in a frequency band higher than about $2f_0$, as compared to the power amplification of said amplifying circuit at the oscillating frequency f_0 .**" (emphasis added)

Claim 4 and 6 recite features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, including the emphasized features.

The Examiner has admitted that **NONE** of the prior art of record teaches or suggests asymmetrical bandpass transfer functions. However, the Examiner alleged that "the claims as recited do not describe an asymmetry with regards [to] the 3dB point being at twice the fundamental." Applicant has amended claims 1, 4 and 6 to recite "said amplifying circuit comprises an element having a frequency characteristic, thereby decreasing power amplification of said amplifying circuit by at least 3dB **in a frequency band lower than about 0.5 times an oscillating frequency f_0 and in a frequency band higher than about $2f_0$** , as compared to the power amplification of said amplifying circuit at the oscillating frequency f_0 " which clearly and specifically recites an asymmetry with regards to the 3dB point. Accordingly, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art of record teaches or suggests

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 23 2003

OFFICIAL

Serial No. 09/731,004
September 22, 2003
Reply to the Office Action dated February 12, 2003
Page 6 of 6

the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in claims 1, 4 and 6 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4 and 6 are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 7-14 depend upon claims 1, 4 and 6, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1, 4 and 6 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2003


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080